

**AGENDA**  
**CALIFORNIA BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

October 7, 2010 - 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Room 2116, 2nd Floor

Department of Transportation

1120 N Street, Sacramento

**PHONE BRIDGE**

**1-877-973-5015**

**Participant Code: 6538211**

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Notes**
3. **District Reports**
4. **Status Reports/Various Items**
  - Highway Design Manual Revision** – Kevin Herritt
  - Bikes on Roadways Training** – Maggie O'Mara
  - Interchange/Intersections Guidelines** – Richard Haggstrom
  - AB 1581 Implementation** – Caltrans Staff
  - Bicyclist Representation on CTCDC** – Jim Baross
  - AB 1358 and DD-64 R1 Implementation** – Caltrans Staff/OPR Staff
  - Statewide Bicycling Task Force** – Task Force Members
  - Bridge Rail** – Caltrans Staff
  - California Vehicle Code 21202 Opinion** – Caltrans Staff
  - Strategic Highway Safety Plan/Challenge Area 13** – Please refer to \_\_\_\_
5. **Unfinished Business**
  - a. **NEV legislation: AB 584, Huber; AB 1781, Villines** – Jim Baross  
Attachment 5.a.  
[http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/asm/ab\\_0551-0600/ab\\_584\\_bill\\_20100601\\_amended\\_sen\\_v96.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/asm/ab_0551-0600/ab_584_bill_20100601_amended_sen_v96.html)  
[http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/asm/ab\\_1751-1800/ab\\_1781\\_bill\\_20100701\\_amended\\_sen\\_v97.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/asm/ab_1751-1800/ab_1781_bill_20100701_amended_sen_v97.html)
6. **New Business**
  - a.
  - b.
  - c.
  - d.
7. **Legislative Update** – Alan Wachtel
8. **Old Business**

**9. Other Business/Topics for Next Meeting/Adjourn**

The next meeting of the California Bicycle Advisory Committee will be on October 7, 2010, 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 2116, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Department of Transportation Headquarters, 1120 N Street in Sacramento.

**SUMMARY NOTES  
CALIFORNIA BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
June 3, 2010 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
Caltrans Headquarters 1120 N Street – Room 2116  
Sacramento, CA**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Alan Wachtel called the meeting to order.

**Members Present: (includes teleconference attendees)**

Alan Wachtel, CBAC Chair – California Association of Bicycling Organizations (CABO)  
Jim Baross, CBAC Vice-Chair – San Diego Co. Bicycle Coalition/CA Bicycle Coalition  
Andrew Casteel – Bay Area Bicycle Coalition  
Sean Co – Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**Others Present: (includes teleconference attendees)**

Glenn Bailey – Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee  
KC Butler – California Bicycle Coalition  
John Cinatl – Caltrans District 6  
Robert Cronin – Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition  
Romeo Estrella – Caltrans District 12  
Alan Forkosh - CABO  
Dan Gutierrez – CABO District 7 Director  
Don Howe – Caltrans Traffic Operations  
David Madden – Caltrans District 6  
Maggie O'Mara – Caltrans Design  
Nicolas Don Paladino - Fresno Cycling Club  
Tami Podesta – Caltrans District 7  
Bob Shanteau – CABO Transportation Engineering Liaison  
Chris Ziegler – District 7 Bicycle Advisory Committee

**Members Absent:**

Hamid Bahadori - Auto Club of Southern California  
Lynne Goldsmith – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Marie Haddad – California State Automobile Association  
Dan Klinker – County of Sacramento  
Ken McGuire – Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit  
Michelle Mowery – City of Los Angeles  
Representative – California Highway Patrol  
Jeffery Rosenhall – California Department of Public Health  
Clark Thompson – Fresno Council of Governments

**2. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Notes**

Notes for the April 1, 2010 meeting were approved with the following corrections:

Addition to Agenda Item 4. **Bicyclist Representation on CTCDC** – Regarding selection of a CBAC representative to the CTCDC: “The representative will be the CBAC Chair or the Chair’s designee. Jim Baross is the designee.”

**District 5 report** was not included in the April 1 notes: District 5 - In April, Caltrans staff will be bringing back the item of bike box experimentation (on SR 227 in San Luis Obispo) to CBAC and the CTCDC. District 5 is continuing to make progress on updating its bike map with the help of GIS students at Cal Poly State University. The district is also starting work on a new bike map solely for the Pacific Coast Bike Route. The map will be an online version only, which users may download and print at home. In March, Caltrans staff continued participation in a working group with various stakeholders led by State Assemblyman Bill Monning to make progress on the California Coastal Trail planning effort through the Big Sur community

### **3. District Reports**

**District 1** – The district is updating the Bike Touring Guide.

**District 2** - The NorCal Bicycle Partnership feels this years Bike To Work Week was a huge success. A new event this year was a worksite commute challenge. Below is some information about how many worksites participated and some statistics. The worksite winner will be receiving a really nice bike rack donated by Healthy Shasta. This is the second year NorCal Bicycle Partnership has organized events for Bike To Work Week and even though the weather was not perfect we in the partnership feel the week was. Also, I will be looking for a day soon to reschedule the Caltrans 7th Annual River Trail at lunch Ride so watch for more information to come.

**Bike Commute Challenge 2010 – Winners!** This year 25 businesses registered for the Bike Commute Challenge. During the Challenge 152 participants rode 3,065 miles, prevented the release of 2,835 pounds of carbon dioxide emissions, 40 pounds of other air pollutants, 145 gallons of fuel and saved \$436.40 on fuel (at \$2.99/gallon) all while commuting by bike!

**NorCal Bicycle Partnership Names Shasta College Bicycle-Friendly Employer of the Year!** Shasta College provides bike racks, inside bike parking, showers, and lockers to their employees, supporting them to commute by bicycle, and has bicycle route maps posted on campus. They had 22 people on their team, riding 74 round trips for a total 758 miles. Second place in the Bike Commute Challenge went to The McConnell Foundation and a very close third to Simpson University. The Independent category was lead by none other than Sundial Pedicab who racked up 85 miles between two employees!

**District 5** – District 5 – Adam Fukushima reported. In recognition of Bike Month, employees of Caltrans District 5 put on a bike breakfast along the Railroad Safety Trail on May 18th to energize bicyclists in the community on their way to work. On May 19th, District Director Rich Krumholz and Deputy Director of Planning Aileen Loe joined with other participants around San Luis Obispo County in the Executive Commuter Challenge. Employees of District 5 also participated in the Commuter Bike Challenge. The latest count showed the Caltrans Atoll Building Team leading the competition among organizations of similar size in all of San Luis Obispo County. The latest count showed Caltrans employee Mark Langowski as leading in the number of miles commuted by a single individual in all of San Luis Obispo County. In April, the bike box Request to Experiment was brought back to the CTCDC by Caltrans HQ staff. The request was not approved but was recommended to be brought to the FHWA. In April, District 5 staff evaluated applications

for the Community Based Transportation Planning and Environmental Justice grants, of which many applications were bicycle and pedestrian related. District 5 staff also gave input on several planning efforts including the Pismo Beach Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan as well as the Morro Bay to Cayucos Connector Trail. Lastly, District 5 staff gave a presentation to the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee on improvements to the Airport Road interchange in Salinas.

Bob Shanteau mentioned an e-mail he received from the Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition inquiring about edge line rumble strips. Inverted profile thermoplastic edge lines are one type of edge line rumble strip. Alan Forkosh had participated in a national conference call where inverted profile thermoplastic edge lines were discussed as a means of addressing run off the road crashes. Don Howe noted inverted profile thermoplastic edge lines were no longer approved for use. Nic Paladino observed that an application not in the standards would not be able to go forward. John Cinatl noted the current shoulder rumble strip guidance in the Caltrans Standard Plans.

**District 6** – Dave Madden reported. First, here in Fresno we conducted our annual "Mall to Mall" event on May 5th which consisted of a 5 mile ride from Manchester Mall (where many of our staff are housed) to the Fulton Mall in downtown Fresno. A total 52 riders participated with police escort and were treated to snacks at a local restaurant.

Secondly, we participated in the annual Bike To Work Corporate Challenge of May 19th. This event is a competition among a variety of Fresno businesses and other government agencies. Our Caltrans "Team Mobility" won the "Mega" division (75 or more riders) for the third consecutive year. We had 77 riders who logged 1,342 miles for the event.

**District 7** - John Cinatl shared a brief presentation about a District 7 project on U.S. 101 in Ventura County that includes a separate path. The freeway shoulder will remain open to bicycle travel after the project is completed. There was a discussion of the intended use of the path – bikes? pedestrians? both? Maggie O'Mara suggested a review of the project initiation documents. Tami Podesta, Caltrans District 7, participated in the discussion. To be continued at the August 2010 meeting.

#### **4. Status Reports/Various Items**

**Highway Design Manual (HDM) Revision** – No report.

**Understanding Bicycle Transportation** – Maggie O'Mara provided an update on the development of the training curriculum, which is intended to increase understanding of the bicycle mode. Maggie emphasized the need to get back to basics. Initial offerings will be primarily for Caltrans staff, could be made available to others in the future. Jim Baross asked if the training would include a session riding a bike. Not at this time. Dave Madden asked about the effects of the state budget and providing the training in other locations. State budget could affect future deliveries. Maggie discussed the possibility of charging a fee for non-Caltrans students. Maggie also discussed students receiving credit for the – if they stay for the entire class. Alan Forkosh asked who's doing the training. Currently

Maggie, Ken McGuire, and Dan Gutierrez. Maggie talked about developing a pool of trainers. Dan noted the curriculum is not Caltrans specific. Jim Baross mentioned the possibility of the California Bicycle Coalition providing funding for some training. KC Butler is the contact. Dan asked for photos of bike facilities to use in the curriculum. Alan Wachtel thanked Maggie, Dan, and Brian De Sousa. Dan offered to save the Powerpoint as a .pdf for sharing.

**Interchange/Intersections Guidelines – No report.**

**AB 1581 Implementation** – Santa Barbara is using video detection for bicycles. Maggie asked about any recent developments concerning the sign that instruct bicyclist to use a pushbutton for a green light. Messrs. Baross, Shanteau, and Wachtel said nothing new had happened.

**Bicyclist Representation on California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)**  
Alan Forkosh suggested CBAC continue to pursue full membership on the CTCDC.

**AB 1358 and DD-64 R1 Implementation – No Report**

**New Statewide Bicycling Task Force** – The Task Force has been working on the training curriculum issue discussed below under **Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)/Challenge Area 13**.

**Bridge Rail – No report**

**California Vehicle Code 21202 Opinion** – Don Howe shared a summary of the Caltrans legal opinion concerning bicyclists in narrow lanes - California Vehicle Code (CVC) section 21202. Attendees discussed the contents of the summary. Bob Shanteau noted the reference to CVC 21656 in CVC 21202. Bob suggested there also be a reference to CVC 21654. The Statewide Bicycling Task Force is discussing this issue with the California Highway Patrol. Alan Wachtel asked about release of the opinion itself. At this time the Department is willing to share the summary. There was additional discussion about release of the opinion and the multiple purposes it could serve when available. Don Howe told the group the Department would be developing guidance for appropriate signage – the Bikes May Use Full Lane (BMUFL) sign – most likely by June 2011. Jim hopes to see the guidance sooner – by January 2011. The group discussed warning vs. regulatory signage. Jim Baross felt the BMUFL regulatory sign was most appropriate. Jim also mentioned the *Bikes in Lane* warning sign currently in use in Santa Cruz. Don welcomed the group's input for the sign and guidance. Jim Baross suggested the effort to develop guidance should refer to the prior work CBAC did on lane width. Maggie prefers the lane width information Dan Gutierrez is developing for the *Understanding Bicycle Transportation* training curriculum. Maggie also suggested the BMUFL sign in lieu of the Share the Road sign currently shown in the typical applications being developed for bikes in work zones. Alan Wachtel thought it might be premature for CBAC to make recommendations. Alan also mentioned the Bike Lane Termination sign – which could be used in work zones if appropriate.

**Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)/Challenge Area 13** – Ken McGuire and Jim Baross reported. One of the CA 13 actions pertains to bicycling information in the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training (POST) curriculum. Jim wants to review the curriculum and meet with POST.

## **5. Unfinished Business**

**a. April 15, 2010 CTCDC Meeting Report** - The CTCDC considered the Department's request to experiment with a bike box in District 5 to be inadequate. The next step would be to request permission from the Federal Highway Administration.

CTCDC link to 4-15-2010 minutes

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/newtech/minutes/Min041510.pdf>

From Jim Baross

First I notice that I am not listed as a member or as an ex-officio member.

That should be remedied; list whoever is delegated to attend for CBAC as an ex-officio member or something.

Second, regarding CTCDC and CBAC, quotes from the minutes:

Chair stated "... there is also a 23 Bicycle Advisory Committee that properly needs to weigh in 24 on the issues that relate to bicycles, that ultimately may 25 come to this Committee. So we've been trying to work together to have a coordinated effort with the Bicycle Advisory Committee, and Wayne Henley and Robert Copp have drafted an Understanding. And basically the Understanding is that the Bicycle Advisory Committee, as it relates to this Committee, needs to be specially recognized. They aren't just an interested public member when issues of bicycles come to this Committee. So it is our intention to recognize them as another colleague of ours that advises Caltrans and for any matter, then, regarding bicycles that is to come to this Committee, the Secretary of the CTCDC will forward that issue over to the Bicycle Advisory Committee so that they can have an opportunity to review it and take a position on that matter. And certainly this Committee is going to value the position that they take and carefully consider it when the matter comes to us. So what Wayne and Robert have done is they've drafted a letter that spells out the understanding of the working relationship between the CBAC and the CTCDC, and it was included in one of the handouts over on the table here. And I'm not going to read it all, but I am going to Devinder that this be placed in the Minutes of our meeting, and it spells out our working relationship. And I would just like to acknowledge and recognize the Vice Chairman of the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Jim Baross.

Thank you for being here today. And yesterday at our workshop meeting we also had the Chairman of the Bicycle Advisory Committee there when we reviewed the chapter on bicycles. So we would like to have your input and we welcome you here today."

On the Bike Box issue:

"COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I do encourage experimentation. This reminds me of queue jumping that we provide for transit vehicles and also medium walks for pedestrians. But as a Committee Member I would recommend

against this particular experiment at this location. I would think with a new device like this, like Long Beach is doing, they'd rather see it at less busy intersections where there's less risk during an experiment. This wouldn't be the first place I'd trying something this different.

But it does seem that -- we were actually shown pictures of what Long Beach was doing and they were using colored asphalt instead of the stripes. So it does seem like we need information and comparative data between -- it's not just should we do a bike box, but exactly what are the dimensions, exactly how is it striped, how does colored pavement work compared to using 12-inch limit lines. Should it be a 12-inch limit line and should it be a 6-inch bike stripe, you know, how big is that particular legend.

And then like we do with pedestrians, I would think we'd want before and after conclusion data. They usually do video conflict monitoring, you do surveys so that you get a feel for does the average cyclist understand the message of the bike boxes, similar to what you were saying about how do they use it. And that's one thing you can't really do control at this type of location because it's such an usual configuration. It really is better at standard right-turn locations where you can have monitored a dozen locations where you've tried it, a dozen locations where you haven't, and during the same period of time see exactly what kind of safety record you have. You can monitor conflicts at both locations. So this really is a very poor location for an experiment, especially because they've never had a bicycle collision.

It can only get worse. I mean, how do you ever improve something at a location where there have been zero bicycle collisions?

We should go with a list of criteria or data that we want back from the experiment, but the bottom line is I would like to see data and bike box experimentation, but I do recommend against this location."

As I read and understand the decision of CTCDC, the request to experiment was not approved but they recommended that the proposal be "beefed up" and submitted to FHWA for experimentation.

Also, there is the issue of just what the experimentation approval process is in California. I think there is need for a clear and more streamlined process.

Knowles said, "I'd just like to comment to Jim that Section 1A of the California MUTCD discusses experimentation requirements. And generally if the experiment would change a national standard that's also applicable in California MUTCD, then generally you need to get approval from the Federal Highway Administration for the experiment and, in addition, because you want to use that experimental device in the State of California, you come also to the CTCDC. It's been our practice that once the FHWA approves it for experimentation, then we generally rubber-stamp the request."

Finally, the work zone drawings issue was generally approved but with an unresolved issue that I brought up, that the wording seemed to only address the applicability of the accommodations for bicyclist on Bike Ways or Bicycle Facilities - I noted that the accommodations should be considered for use on any facility/roadway that bicycles are not prohibited from using.

I stated: " MR. BAROSS: As I previously stated, this hasn't been brought back to CBAC. I can't say I'm speaking for the California Bicycle Advisor Committee, but I have strong reservations to -- although it's a step in the right direction -- to providing accommodations for bicycling only on Class One, Two, or Three facilities. Most bicycling occurs on shared roadways. Most construction occurs on shared roadways. Accommodations for bicyclists should occur on shared roadways.

To respond to your question about a roadway which doesn't, a rural roadway that doesn't have a shoulder, if the bicyclists are riding on that road they're already taking a lane and the deflected traffic doesn't, I don't think, I'm going to have to look at more detail, doesn't need the addition of another accommodation, that the roadway's already constricted.

But to restate, most bicycling occurs on shared roadways. Most construction occurs on shared roadways. It's most appropriate for accommodation of bicycles in construction zones not to be limited to Class One, Two, or Three."

I was then and am now not sure how J. Bhullar will rework the proposal since the committee gave him leeway to adjust the wording. Committee Chair Fisher said, " All that I would ask is that we have very clear language that tells the construction entity, the utility company, the traffic engineer, "If this, I do that." And that's why when we have a term like "bicycle facilities" or "bicycle routes," (it is) not real clear. On the other hand you'd say a Class One, Two, or Three, it's very clear. He knows exactly what he needs to do. And I would just offer that on page 45 if we could change that as an editorial comment, I think it becomes very clear."

Jim Baross

**b. Bike Lane Termination** - -- Bob Shanteau noted CBAC's approval of his drawing for the sign. CTCDC recommended he contact the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD). Bob has been in contact with NCUTCD member Richard Moeur Arizona Department of Transportation. The BLT is a pending action item for the NCUTCD. The discussion addressed potential locations to experiment with the sign in California -- in cities, counties, or on state highways. Maggie asked about Caltrans sponsorship. Don Howe said he could ask the districts. Alan suggested the best location for the sign would be where the bike lane ends and the route becomes unclear. Some attendees questioned the need to experiment with the sign, since there are similar signs already approved to indicate the termination of other preferential lanes. Don said the BTL is a new traffic control device. Bob mentioned three locations where conditions change -- shoulders, wide lanes, and narrow lanes -- and discussed warning bicyclists about changing conditions. There was also a discussion about the possible need for the sign at all intersections where bike lanes end. Don complimented Bob for his efforts on the sign. Don will try to identify a location for experimentation.

## **6. New Business**

**a. Adoption of National MUTCD Bike Items in CA** -- California has accepted all of the national guidance for the California MUTCD. A potential CBAC issue could be the lack of a requirement for bike lane signs in the national guidance. Jim Baross noted the



recent addition to the California MUTCD of the motorcycle/bicycle detection guidance required by AB 1581.

**b. Bike Month 2010/Tour of California - California Bike Commute** – KC Butler, California Bicycle Coalition, discussed the 16 year history of the California Bike Commute promotion. Initially the focus was on a single day – which grew to a week. The League of American Bicyclists also has a week long promotion. According to KC, there is a lot more interest now than there was initially. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) did not have much involvement initially. Several now allocate funding for promotions that last for a day, a week, or a month. Many regions and cities are also involved. The San Francisco Bay area scheduled its 2010 events to minimize conflicts with the Tour of California. KC is working with former Caltrans Director Will Kempton – now at the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) – to promote bike commuting in Orange County. OCTA is more involved than in prior years. KC emphasizes training to prepare bicyclists for commuting, riding in traffic etc. KC discussed working with the media to publicize Bike to Work Day. He mentioned concerns about the safety of new bike commuters. Smart Cycling classes are becoming more common statewide. KC appreciates the emphasis on and increase in training opportunities. KC discussed plans to increase the statewide promotion from a week to a month and also emphasize year round - rather than one week or one month - bike commuting – with more training for bicyclists. Some strategies for increasing bike commuting include identifying reasons for not biking to work – or everywhere; providing incentives such as gift certificates to a bike shop. Jim Baross supports training to develop the skills needed to bike in traffic – as well as a public relations effort to promote training for all bicyclists, not just children. KC Agrees with Jim.

**Tour of California** - KC also discussed the 2011 Tour of California and the good turnout in Sacramento – likely due to Lance Armstrong's presence.

**c. CHP/POST Training on Bicycle Laws** – Please refer to the notes for **New Statewide Bicycling Task Force** and **Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)/Challenge Area 13**.

**7. Legislative Update** June 4 is the deadline for bills to pass the house of origin.

**AB 1951, Ammiano** - The bill is about penalties for violating a traffic law and injuring a person. It is dead for this year. It might be introduced next year or the content might appear in another bill.

**AB 2294, Block and Fletcher** - would authorize the County of San Diego or cities in the county to require Pedicab operators to obtain a California Driver's License. Statewide and local bicycling organizations are opposing the bill on the basis that a driver's license is not appropriate for a pedicab. Status - May 13 Referred to Committee on Transportation and Housing.

**SB 1061, Hancock** – Bill would allow toll bridge funding to be used for a San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge west span pedestrian, bicycle, and maintenance path. The

bill would prohibit the Bay Area Toll Authority from increasing tolls to fund this project. Status - June 3: to Assemble Committee on transportation.

**SB 1475, Simitian** – Bill concerns education about and penalties for operating a handheld cell phone or texting while driving or bicycling. Status: June 3 Read third time. Passed. To Assembly.

**SB 1318** – The Omnibus Transportation Bill. The bill would correct a prior drafting error concerning passing on the right. Status June 3, From committee with author's amendments. Read second time. Amended. Re-referred to Committee on Transportation.

**8. Old Business** – None

**9. Other Business / Topics For Next Meeting / Adjourn**

**Walk/Bike Conference 2011** - KC Butler mentioned the possibility of a 2011 California Walk/Bike Conference and League Cycling Instructor summit. Sean Co asked about the conference location. KC would prefer Southern California.

**Class I Bikeway Operations** – Glenn Bailey, Chair of the Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee (LABAC) led a discussion about bicyclists impeded by other users on bike paths in Los Angeles. Applicable statutes are Section 890.4 of the Streets and Highways Code and 21211 of the California Vehicle Code. The City of Los Angeles posts signs that require bicyclists to yield to pedestrian on paths, which some attendees considered reasonable – considering the bicyclists' potential to injure other path users if a crash occurs. Alan Wachtel mentioned the fact that Class I Bikeways in California are shared use paths. Other points raised during the discussion included – various activities that occur on paths – such as fishing from or congregating on the path. The group noted the absence of statewide rules for yielding on paths. Jim Baross noted the multiple issues concerning paths – the lack of consistent policies concerning the side of the path pedestrians should use – facing or against bicycle traffic – (Jim favors ped travel facing traffic), path maintenance, the lack of enforcement and crash reports; the role of paths in Los Angeles – sometimes they provide the only reasonable route; Nic Paladino noted the absence of sidewalks on Fresno area streets with paths. Glen mentioned the issue of delineating space for bikes and pedestrians on the Orange Line path in Los Angeles. Glen also asked about the definition of “adjacent” – in the context of adjacent pedestrian facilities, for example. The group also noted expenditures to construct Class I bike paths – without rules for pedestrian direction of travel, yielding etc. – are not maximizing benefits for bikes. Dan Gutierrez mentioned the Los Angeles Bicycle Advisory Committee's recommendation for a local ordinance concerning bike path operation. Alan Wachtel noted the broader issue – of regulating direction of travel which prioritizes the various uses of paths. Alan noted the political aspect of the issue. Maggie O'Mara noted the striping intended to delineate space for bikes and pedestrians does not separate users. Maggie noted the benefits of providing good on street options for bicycle travel.

**Bike in Work Zones** – The group applauded Johnny Bhullar's efforts on the work zone typical applications. There was concern about the guidance being applicable to bikeways

rather than all roads where bicycle are permitted to operate. The inconsistent definition of bikeways was mentioned. Don Howe mentioned the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Part 6 language about accommodating all modes in work zones. The language does not limit the applicability to mention bikeways. A motion recommending the guidance be applicable to all roads where bicycles are not prohibited and all bike paths passed unanimously.

**Alfred Zampa Bridge Bicycle Access** – Beth Thomas, Caltrans district 4 is researching the current bike access policy for the bridge and related signage. She will report at the August 2010 meeting.